

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/538,132	Applicant(s) KAWAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner GARY D. HARRIS	Art Unit 1794	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) GARY D. HARRIS. (3)_____.

(2) Michael Markowitz. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 April 2009.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Senda et al. US 5, 990,417.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that Senda does not disclose the particular structure as claimed such that noise suppression would be in the GHz range. After further considering the Senda ref., examiner agrees with applicant and has allowed the case. As agreed in an interview it is not necessary for the atty to do an additional interview summary.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Gary D. Harris/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/K.M.B/
Acting SPE, Art Unit 1794